



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/692,765	10/19/2000	Thomas E. Saulpaugh	5181-65700	8734

7590 08/03/2005  
Robert C Kowert  
Conley Rose & Tayon PC  
P O Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER	
PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/692,765

Applicant(s)

SAULPAUGH ET AL.

Examiner

Ashok B. Patel

Art Unit

2154

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-48.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: please refer to continuation sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**JOHN FOLLANSBEE**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

continuation sheet:

Section 102 (e) Rejection:

Applicant's argument: Claim 1:

"Regarding claim 1, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Bass clearly fails to disclose receiving a message in a data representation language sent to a client platform in the distributed computing environment from a service in the distributed computing environment, wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of an event generated by the service."  
 "However, SMTP is a protocol, not a data representation language. Data representation languages are well understood in the art. No one of ordinary skill in the art would consider SMTP (or any other similar network protocol) to be a data representation language."  
 "Bass does not teach that the messages sent using these protocols are messages in a data representation language."  
 "Bass does not mention using messages in a data representation language."  
 "The prior art does not teach the use of a data representation language to represents events 'in messages between entities in a distributed computing environment."  
 "Additionally, Bass fails to anticipate wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of an event generated by the service."  
 "Furthermore, Bass fails to anticipate sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes registered to receive the event from the service."

Examiner's response:

Claim 1 recites:

(1) "receiving a message in a data representation language ", as such, the message consists of a data representation language,  
 (2) further, claim 1 goes on reciting "the message includes a data representation language representation of an event ", as such, the message includes and represents an event, and  
 (3) further, claim 1 goes on reciting "sending the data representation language representation of the event to one or more processes ", as such, the message representing and including the is sent to one or more processes.

Bass teaches in col. 3, line 36-50, Fig. 1, " The adapter also converts communications and data into a format for transmission on the Internet (or other network). The format may use transmission control protocol/Internet protocol (TCP/IP), simple mail transport protocol (SMTP), File Transfer Protocol (FTP), or whatever protocol is useable by the connecting network. Thus, the flow of information for FIG. 1 is as follows. An event originating in a process adapter 18 in domain 112 is delivered to the subscribing channel adapter 14. This event would be transformed into (for example) an e-mail via SMTP, (the message includes and represents an event,), and mailed from the channel adapter through the Internet to domain 213. The e-mail is received by the channel adapter 15 and re-transformed back into the event(the message includes and represents an event,). The channel adapter then delivers the event to any subscribing process adapters within the domain. (the message representing and including the is sent to one or more processes.)"

Applicant's argument: Claim 2

"Regarding claim 2, Bass fails to anticipate receiving a data representation language schema on the client platform, wherein the data representation language schema defines a message interface for a set of events generated by the service."

"The Examiner has not cited any portion of Bass that teaches a data representation language schema defining a message interface for a set of events. Instead, Bass teaches that each channel adapter includes two different interfaces for communicating event information."

"Bass does not teach that his event export lists make up a data representation language schema. Bass also does not mention that the event export lists are exchanged using a data representation language. Furthermore, Bass does not describe his event export lists as defining message interfaces."

"Bass does not teach generating an event message endpoint for the client platform according to the data representation language schema. Thus Bass clearly fails to disclose generating an event message endpoint for the client platform according to the data representation language schema."

Examiner's response:

Bass teaches in col.3, lines 43-50, col.4, lines 43 through col.5, line 15, col.2, lines 4-15, "Each channel adapter is initialized (generating an event message endpoint ) with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain. The two channel adapters handshake with these sets of events. Process adapters within each domain can then publish events of the exported type and expect the event to be carried to the other domain via the network protocol. Likewise, a process adapter can subscribe to an event type from a channel adapter that is listed on an event type list from its peer channel adapter. When an event is received via the channel adapter and re-published into the domain, the subscribing process adapter will receive the event." Thereby the reference teaches that each channel adapter is initialized with a set of events it will export to its peer at the other domain and they handshake with sets of events even though they are in a completely different domains (receiving a data representation language schema on the client platform, wherein said data representation language schema defines a message interface for a set of events generated by the service). Please also refer to Bass's disclosure as stated and explained above.

Applicant's argument: Claim 3

"The event delivered by the channel adapters is clearly not a data representation language representation of the event. Thus, the Examiner's cited passage actually supports Applicants' argument."

Examiner's response:

Bass teaches in col. 3, line 36-50, Fig. 1, " The adapter also converts communications and data into a format for transmission on the Internet (or other network)."

Applicant's argument: Claim 4

"Nowhere does Bass mention anything regarding data representation language messages including authentication credentials nor about event message endpoints using an authentication credential to authenticate the data representation language message."

Examiner's response:

Bass's Col. 1, lines 56-60 describes the purpose of its invention as being "Therefore, there is a need in the art for a mechanism to link to disparate PUB/SUB domains together without compromising security, reducing performance, be easy to implement, and still allow for information transfer between the two domains. " and as such the process described in col. 4, line 57 through col. 5, line 15 teaches the elements of claim

4.

Applicant's argument: Claim 5

"Not only does the cited passage fail to mention verifying type correctness of any messages, the passage also fail to mention anything regarding the use of a data representation language schema to verify type correctness. "

Examiner's response:

Bass teaches in col. 4, line 18-24, "Each channel mechanism 26, 27. This mechanism informs the events being processed by the adapter. The administrator could determine if there are any events that are stuck, and the state in which they are stuck. This would permit the adapter also includes reporting administrator of the status of the administrator to perform error reporting to the system, as well as initiate recovery mechanisms." (the event message endpoint verifying type correctness of the data representation language message according to the data representation language schema.)

Applicant's argument: claim 6

Regarding claim 6, Bass fails to anticipate wherein the data representation language schema defines a set of messages that the service may send to the event message endpoint and further fails to teach the event message endpoint verifying the correctness of the data representation language message from the service according to the data representation language schema.

Examiner's response:

Please refer to examiner's response provided above for claims 1 , 2, and 5.

Applicant's argument: Claim 8

Regarding claim 8, Bass fails to teach each of the one or more processes providing an event handler callback method to the event message endpoint.

Examiner's response:

Claim 8 recites "registering interest in one or more of the set of events comprises each of the one or more processes providing an event handler callback method to the event message endpoint". Bass teaches in col. 4, lines 43 through col. 5, line 6, Note that the terms publish and subscribe should not be used in describing the flow of control in sending an event across the system. For example, assume process adapter 1 19 of domain 213 has an event that is to be shared with any interested process adapters 18 of domain 112. The sending channel adapter 15 will receive the event from the process adapter 19 within its domain by subscribing to the event with the broker 17. Thus, when the event is published by the originating process adapter 19, the sending channel adapter 15 will receive the event, reformat the event and send it to the channel adapter 14 of domain 1 12 via Internet 11 . event, and then publishes. The receiving channel adapter 14 reformats the event to the broker 16, which republishes the event to subscribing process adapter 18 within domain 1 12. Thus, prior to transfer of events between the domains. the respective process and channel adapters of the domains must be configured to send and receive the different events." (each of the one or more processes providing an event handler callback method to the event message endpoint).

Applicant's argument: Claim 10

Regarding claim 10, Bass does not teach receiving the data representation language schema of the service in a service advertisement of the service.

Examiner's response:

In conjunction with the reasons provided for claim 2 above, please refer to Bass's teachings in col.3, lines 43-50, col.4, lines 43 through col.5, line 15, col.2, lines 4-15.

Applicant's argument: Claim 27

"Regarding claim 27, Bass fails to anticipate a service process configured to generate a message in a data representation language."

"Bass further fails to anticipate wherein the message includes a data representation language representation of the event generated by the service process."

"Bass also does not anticipate wherein each of the one or more event message gate units is operable to distribute the data representation language representation of the event, as asserted by the Examiner."

Examiner's response:

Please refer to Examiner's response for claim 1. Also refer to Fig. 1 , elements 16 and 17.

Applicant's argument: Claim 29

"Regarding claim 29, Bass fails to anticipate a service process configured to provide a data representation language schema defining a message interface for a set of events generated by the service and also fails to teach wherein one or more event message gate units are generated according to the data representation language schema."

Examiner's response:

Please refer to Examiner's response for claim 1.

Applicant's argument: Claims 31 and 32

"Regarding claim 31, Bass does not teach a service process configured to provide the data representation language schema in a service advertisement."

"Regarding claim 32, Bass fails to teach the event message endpoint subscribing to one or more of the set of events generated by the service, wherein the service is configured to send messages including data representation language representations of an event to subscribers to the event when the event is generated."

Examiner's response:

Please refer to Examiner's response for claims 1 and 3.

Section 103(a) Rejections:

Applicant's argument:

"The Office Action rejected claims 12, 13, 25, 26, 34, 35, 47 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Bass in view of Meltzer et al. (U.S. Patent '6,542,912) (hereinafter "Meltzer"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons given above regarding their respective independent claims."

Examiner's response:

Please refer to Examiner's responses provided above.